

NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF TITLE I



2015-2016 TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PLAN*

*This plan is only for Title I schoolwide programs that are not identified as a Priority or Focus Schools.

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - ESEA§1114

DISTRICT INFORMATION	SCHOOL INFORMATION
District: FOUNDATION ACADEMIES	School: Foundation Academies
Chief School Administrator: GRAIG WEISS	Address: 363 West State Street, Trenton, NJ 08618
Chief School Administrator's E-mail: gweiss@foundationacademies.org	Grade Levels: K, 1 st , 3 rd – 12 th
Title I Contact: Kate Moody	Principal: Danielle Venable (K, 1 st , 3 rd) Sheria Andrews (4 th – 8 th), Shavonne McMillan (9 th – 12 th)
Title I Contact E-mail: kmoody@foundationacademies.org	Principal's E-mail: dvenable@foundationacademies.org sandrews@foundationacademies.org smcmillan@foundationacademies.org
Title I Contact Phone Number: (609) 331-1268	Principal's Phone Number: (609) 920-9200

Principal's Certification

The following certification must be made by the principal of the school. Please Note: A signed Principal's Certification must be scanned and included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

☒ I certify that I have been included in consultations related to the priority needs of my school and participated in the completion of the Schoolwide Plan. As an active member of the planning committee, I provided input for the school's Comprehensive Needs Assessment and the selection of priority problems. I concur with the information presented herein, including the identification of programs and activities that are funded by Title I, Part A.

Sheria Andrews
Principal's Name (Print)

On File
Principal's Signature

6/30/2015
Date

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - ESEA§1114

Critical Overview Elements

- The School held 2 (number) of stakeholder engagement meetings.
- State/local funds to support the school were \$ 11,221,872, which comprised 92.3% of the school's budget in 2014-2015.
- State/local funds to support the school will be \$11,799,969, which will comprise 92.9% of the school's budget in 2015-2016.
- Title I funded programs/interventions/strategies/activities in 2015-2016 include the following:

Item	Related to Priority Problem #	Related to Reform Strategy	Budget Line Item (s)	Approximate Cost
Co-teachers	1. Closing the Achievement Gap 2. Language Arts Literacy and Reading 3. Mathematics	Closing the Achievement Gap	100-100 200-200	\$406,696 \$105,741
Technology (graphing calculators for high school students)	1. Closing the Achievement Gap 3. Mathematics	Closing the Achievement Gap	100-600	\$31,445
Saturday School	1. Closing the Achievement Gap 2. Language Arts Literacy and Reading 3. Mathematics	Closing the Achievement Gap	100-100 200-200	\$24,750 \$1,893
After School Math Tutoring	1. Closing the Achievement Gap 3. Mathematics	Closing the Achievement Gap	100-300	\$22,500

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - ESEA§1114

Summer Program	1. Closing the Achievement Gap 2. Language Arts Literacy and Reading 3. Mathematics	Closing the Achievement Gap	100-100 200-200	\$19,740 \$1,510
Instructional Supplies (additional books and materials for reading and math instruction for co-taught classes)	1. Closing the Achievement Gap 2. Language Arts Literacy and Reading 3. Mathematics	Closing the Achievement Gap	100-600	\$15,223
Onsite & Offsite PDs	1. Closing the Achievement Gap 2. Language Arts Literacy and Reading 3. Mathematics	Closing the Achievement Gap	200-300 (onsite) 200-500 (offsite)	\$9,000 \$6,000
Parental Involvement	1. Closing the Achievement Gap 2. Language Arts Literacy and Reading 3. Mathematics	Closing the Achievement Gap	200-600	\$7,500

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)*

ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii): "The comprehensive plan shall be . . . - developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, and administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, and, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students from such school;"

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee

Select committee members to develop the Schoolwide Plan.

Note: For purposes of continuity, some representatives from this Comprehensive Needs Assessment stakeholder committee should be included in the stakeholder/schoolwide planning committee. Identify the stakeholders who participated in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and/or development of the plan. Signatures should be kept on file in the school office. Print a copy of this page to obtain signatures. **Please Note:** A scanned copy of the Stakeholder Engagement form, with all appropriate signatures, must be included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

****Add lines as necessary.***

Name	Stakeholder Group	Participated in Comprehensive Needs Assessment	Participated in Plan Development	Participated in Program Evaluation	Signature
Barbara Zjawin	Staff	✓	✓	✓	On file
Kate Moody	NCLB Coordinator	✓	✓	✓	On file
Jacqueline Martinez	Staff	✓		✓	On file
Lorrie Weaver	Teacher	✓	✓	✓	On file
Graig Weiss	CEO	✓	✓	✓	On file
Justin Polonco	Student	✓	✓	✓	On file
Craig Jackson	Student	✓	✓	✓	On file
Cynthia Cardona	Teacher	✓	✓	✓	On file
Alexandra Forrester	Teacher	✓	✓	✓	On file
Doloris Johnson	Parent	✓	✓	✓	On file
Thomas Dougherty	Teacher	✓		✓	On file
Peter Oswald	Teacher	✓		✓	On file

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)*

Ashley Van Dyke	Teacher	✓		✓	On file
Sheria Andrews	Principal	✓	✓	✓	On file
Isabel Goss	Staff	✓	✓	✓	On file
Ajanta Shah	Staff	✓	✓	✓	On file
Tara Pepe	Staff	✓	✓	✓	On file

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)*

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee Meetings

Purpose:

The Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee organizes and oversees the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process; leads the development of the schoolwide plan; and conducts or oversees the program's annual evaluation.

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee meetings should be held at least quarterly throughout the school year. List below the dates of the meetings during which the Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee discussed the Comprehensive Needs Assessment, Schoolwide Plan development, and the Program Evaluation. Agenda and minutes of these meetings must be kept on file in the school and, upon request, provided to the NJDOE.

Date	Location	Topic	Agenda on File		Minutes on File	
			Yes	No	Yes	No
6/12/2015	363 West State Street Trenton, NJ 08618	Comprehensive Needs Assessment	Yes		Yes	
6/19/2015	363 West State Street Trenton, NJ 08618	Schoolwide Plan Development	Yes		Yes	
6/12/2015	363 West State Street Trenton, NJ 08618	Program Evaluation	Yes		Yes	

**Add rows as necessary.*

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)*

School's Mission

A collective vision that reflects the intents and purposes of schoolwide programs will capture the school's response to some or all of these important questions:

- What is our intended purpose?
- What are our expectations for students?
- What are the responsibilities of the adults who work in the school?
- How important are collaborations and partnerships?
- How are we committed to continuous improvement?

What is the school's mission statement?	Our mission is to ensure that all of our students secure the academic knowledge and skills to prepare them for the nation's finest colleges and to instill in them the core values of caring, respect, responsibility and honesty
--	---

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

24 CFR § 200.26(c): Core Elements of a Schoolwide Program (Evaluation). A school operating a schoolwide program must—(1) Annually evaluate the implementation of, and results achieved by, the schoolwide program, using data from the State's annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement; (2) Determine whether the schoolwide program has been effective in increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students who had been furthest from achieving the standards; and (3) Revise the plan, as necessary, based on the results of the evaluation, to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program.

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Schoolwide Program *

(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program in 2014-2015, or earlier)

1. Did the school implement the program as planned?

Yes – the identified main program focal point was closing the achievement gap, with a focus on language arts, literacy, reading and math.

2. What were the strengths of the implementation process?

LANGUAGE ARTS, LITERACY and READING

During the 2014-15, we assessed students' reading levels in grades 3 through 8 using STAR Reading assessments. At the beginning of the year, 80% of 3rd grade was reading on grade level. While grades 4 through 8 began the school year with less than 50% of students on grade level, these grades showed improvement throughout the year. We analyzed the improvement of students who were not on grade level by the end of the year, and found that 15% or more of our students had improved by a grade level or more by April. This improvement shows that our students' reading levels are progressing at a faster rate than expected, suggesting the effectiveness of the reading supports that the school is providing.

- At the beginning of the year, 37% of 4th grade was reading on grade level which improved to 44% by the end of the school year. In addition, of those who were not on grade level by the end of the year, 23% improved by a grade level or better by the end of the year. This means that, by the end of the year, a total of **67% of 4th grade** was reading on grade level or were improving at a faster rate than expected.
- At the beginning of the year, 32% of 5th grade was reading on grade level which improved to 46% by the end of the school year. In addition, of those who were not on grade level by the end of the year, 15% improved by a grade level or better by the end of the year. This means that, by the end of the year, a total of **61% of 5th grade** was reading on grade level or were improving at a faster rate than expected.
- At the beginning of the year, 39% of 6th grade was reading on grade level which improved to 36% by the end of the school year. In addition, of those who were not on grade level by the end of the year, 18% improved by a grade level or better by the end of the year. This means that, by the end of the year, a total of **58% of 6th grade** was reading on grade level or were improving at a faster rate than expected.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

- At the beginning of the year, 23% of 7th grade was reading on grade level which improved to 31% by the end of the school year. In addition, of those who were not on grade level by the end of the year, 36% improved by a grade level or better by the end of the year. This means that, by the end of the year, a total of **67% of 7th grade** was reading on grade level or were improving at a faster rate than expected.
- At the beginning of the year, 22% of 8th grade was reading on grade level which stayed constant at 22% by the end of the school year. In addition, of those who were not on grade level by the end of the year, 42% improved by a grade level or better by the end of the year. This means that, by the end of the year, a total of **64% of 8th grade** was reading on grade level or were improving at a faster rate than expected.

While there is more work to be done to close the Achievement Gap, students are making progress in literacy. Our goal is to provide excellent education for our students starting in Kindergarten so that they are better prepared for the later grades. According to the STEP Reading Assessment, **81% of Kindergarten** was reading on grade level by the end of 2014-15, which suggests that the interventions are effectively preparing students for success in reading.

We also assessed our students using 4 benchmark assessments throughout 2014-15 called Foundation Academy Interim Formative Assessments (FAIFAs). These assessments are internal assessments that assess students' progress toward proficiency in the Common Core State Standards. FAIFAs are used to identify students who are struggling and who would benefit from additional support. Teachers also use FAIFA data to develop reteach plans based on the standards that students most struggled with. On the last round of FAIFAs in April, **50% (or more) of 3rd grade, 6th grade, 7th, and 12th grade** were proficient on the Literacy FAIFAs (59%, 56%, 50%, and 58%, respectively).

In order to maintain and improve our performance, we will continue to utilize the co-teaching model in Language Arts Literacy. Having two teachers helps decrease the teacher to student ratio in the reading and writing classes and contributes to effective, rigorous differentiation. We have trained reading and writing educators to incorporate rigorous differentiation into their classrooms 95% to 100% of the time, in order to meet the reading and writing needs of all students. Additionally, struggling students are identified using FAIFA scores and are invited to attend Saturday School in order to build literacy skills using iReady, small group instruction, and one-on-one tutoring in remedial skills. We plan to better support students' literacy skills by adding a Summer Academy during the summer of 2015, which will be an extension of the Saturday School program.

MATHEMATICS

According to the April 2015 administration of our internal benchmark assessments, Foundation Academy Interim Formative Assessments (FAIFAs), 3rd grade and 5th grade performed the best in mathematics (55% proficiency for 3rd grade and 53% proficiency for 5th grade). The

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

lower grades are performing the best in the school on our internal math assessments, which indicates the effectiveness of the lower grade math programs. We have been using a co-teaching model in mathematics classes in the lower grades, which we will continue to do so that students have increased access to support and rigorous differentiation. Struggling students are identified using FAIFA scores to attend Saturday School remediation in math skills using iReady, small group instruction, and one-on-one tutoring. We will be increasing our math support for struggling students by adding a Summer Academy during the summer of 2015, which will be an extension of the Saturday School program.

3. What implementation challenges and barriers did the school encounter?

LANGUAGE ARTS, LITERACY and READING

Although our students showed improvements in reading levels throughout the year (described above), our STAR Reading data from April 2015 indicates room for growth in reading. Despite the gains that our students have made in reading, more than 50% of our students are not yet reading on grade level. As of April 2015:

- 81% of Kindergarten is reading on grade level (STEP Reading Assessment)
- 77% of 3rd grade is reading on grade level
- 44% of 4th grade is reading on grade level
- 46% of 5th grade is reading on grade level
- 36% of 6th grade is reading on grade level
- 31% of 7th grade is reading on grade level
- 22% of 8th grade is reading on grade level

Our reading data for grades 3-8, indicate a dramatic difference between 3rd grade and the other grades. This decrease in reading proficiency with this year's 4th through 8th graders could be due to a shift in the types of reading materials that they encounter. The use of informational texts increases in 4th grade according to the Common Core State Standards. It could be that our students' relate better to fictional texts than to nonfiction, which means that we need to continue focusing on reading improvement.

Our April FAIFA results also showed that 4th grade, 5th grade, 8th grade, and 9th through 12th grade are below 50% proficiency in literacy:

- 31% of 4th grade is proficient
- 47% of 5th grade is proficient
- 38% of 8th grade is proficient
- 12% of 9th grade is proficient

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

- 14% of 10th grade is proficient
- 18% of 11th grade is proficient

The lower proficiency rates can partially be explained by the change to Common Core. In previous years, the school was performing better than the scores reflected above. The appearance of decreased scores in 2014-15 is due to a change in the assessments that were used to determine proficiency. Previously, students were assessed using New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJ ASK), an external assessment on which our students were performing fairly well. Since we do not yet have the data from the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC), we have been using our internal benchmark assessments (FAIFAs) to collect data on our students. The FAIFAs are written to align to the Common Core State Standards and similar to the rigor of the PARCC. Additionally, the level of difficulty of the exams is such that a score of 55% or better is considered proficient for grades K-8 and 60% for grades 9-12. In part, our students struggle on the FAIFAs because they are written to be difficult tests. Since we hold high expectations for all students we assess them at a highly rigorous level.

MATHEMATICS

On the April 2015 mathematics FAIFAs, 4th grade, 6th through 12th grade students struggled in math. Our April 2015 FAIFA results showed that:

- 28% of 4th grade was proficient (mean: 44.4%)
- 33% of 6th grade was proficient (mean: 47.6%)
- 16% of 7th grade was proficient (mean: 34.1%)
- 36% of 8th grade was proficient (mean: 52%)
- 23% of Algebra 1 students were proficient (mean: 38.9%)
- 13% of Geometry students were proficient (mean: 31.4%)
- 24% of Algebra 2 students were proficient (mean: 47.9%)
- 14% of Precalculus students were proficient (mean: 48.7%)
- 17% of AP Calculus were proficient (mean: 34.1%)

As discussed above, we have focused more on the data from our internal benchmark assessments (FAIFAs) instead of the NJ ASK. FAIFAs are rigorous tests that are similar to the PARCC, and we expect the mean to be around 50%. All of our high school math classes are performing at a mean less than 50%, showing that our high school students need additional support in math. More importantly, our students' lower scores in high school point to a need to continue focusing on better preparing our students for high school.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

4. What were the apparent strengths and weaknesses of each step during the program(s) implementation?

Described above.

5. How did the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the programs?

The Title I Committee, representative of all stakeholders, received informative academic data that allowed them to assess current and future needs. The Title I Committee also participated in the development of the Schoolwide Plan.

6. What were the perceptions of the staff? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the staff's perceptions?

Although we are proud of the performance of our students, our staff knows that we must continuously use our resources to the best of our ability to continue to raise the overall achievement level of all of our students. We use The New Teacher Project (TNTP) and Survey Monkey to collect data about teacher and staff perceptions.

7. What were the perceptions of the community? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the community's perceptions?

The community is in exact agreement with our staff. Both community and staff are in support of our expansion efforts (based on our desire to serve more students) and believe that we are one of the strongest academic options that students have in the city of Trenton, NJ. We use Survey Monkey to collect data about the perceptions of the community.

8. What were the methods of delivery for each program (i.e. one-on-one, group session, etc.)?

Extended year, extended day, one-on-one and small group tutoring, and additional in-class support.

9. How did the school structure the interventions?

CO-TEACHING OF ELA AND MATH

Two teachers work together to do much more than deliver the normal curriculum. The second teacher helps to decrease the teacher to student ratio, but, more importantly, identifies struggling students and delivers effective and rigorous differentiation. We train the co-teachers to incorporate rigorous differentiation into their classrooms 95% to 100% of the time, in order to meet the needs of struggling students in ELA and mathematics. Co-teaching is an important component to improve our academic program. We use co-teaching in

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

several of our ELA and math classes leading up to high school (in grades K-8) in order to close the achievement gap before students get to high school. We believe that students need to have a strong foundation before 9th grade in order to be successful in high school. While we are focusing on improving how we prepare students for high school, we are also planning to add a co-teacher at the high school level to provide increased remediation for the students who are struggling the most.

SATURDAY SCHOOL

Saturday School is a Title I funded program during which certified teachers provide support in remediation for ELA and math. Students are identified for the Saturday School program using our internal benchmark assessments (FAIFAs). The students who perform in the lowest third of each administration of the FAIFAs are invited to attend Saturday School via contact with their parents/guardians. The base of the curriculum is iReady Math and Language Arts. Teachers use the assessments in iReady to identify students for small group and one-on-one remediation help.

10. How frequently did students receive instructional interventions?

Students receive co-teaching interventions on a daily basis in several ELA and math classes. Students who are identified for Saturday School attend from October to April, 3 days per month, 4 hours per day. Students who are identified for Saturday School attend for 3 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day. Students who are identified for the after school program attend 1 day per week, 90 minutes per day.

11. What technologies did the school use to support the program?

Prometheans
Smart boards
Scholastic Sri lexile testing
Lenovo laptops

12. Did the technology contribute to the success of the program and, if so, how?

The technology improved learning. Having access to technology is important because our students must be prepared for the PARCC which is a computer-based test. Increased access to technology ensures that our students can integrate the knowledge and skills they are learning with the technological skills necessary to be successful on the PARCC.

****Provide a separate response for each question.***

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Student Performance

State Assessments-Partially Proficient

Provide the number of students at each grade level listed below who scored partially proficient on state assessments for two years or more in English Language Arts and Mathematics, and the interventions the students received.

NOTE: Since we do not have state assessment data for 2013-14 that is comparable to 2014-15 due to the shift from NJ ASK to PARCC, we will be using internal benchmark assessments (FAIFAs) to determine proficiency. Proficiency is defined to be a score of 55% or better for grades 3 through 8 and 60% or better for grades 9 through 12.

English Language Arts	2013-2014	2014-2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions <i>did</i> or <i>did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 4	N/A	54 (out of 78 on April FAIFA 2015)	Co-teaching Saturday School Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed	Several of our students join Foundation drastically below grade level. As our numbers show, our students' reading levels improved over the year, but there is still work to do. Co-teachers have supported struggling readers as they provided reading remediation in targeted small groups. Saturday school has provided the lowest performing students additional opportunity for improvement in ELA. There is still work to be done to close the achievement gap at this level.
Grade 5	44 (out of 86 on April FAIFA 2014)	43 (out of 81 on April FAIFA 2015)	Co-teaching Saturday School Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed	Several of our students join Foundation drastically below grade level. As our numbers show, our students' reading levels improved over the year, but there is still work to do. Co-teachers have supported struggling readers as they provided reading remediation in targeted small groups. Saturday school has provided the lowest performing students additional opportunity for improvement in ELA. There is still work to be done to close the achievement gap at this level.
Grade 6	20 (out of 58 on April FAIFA)	36 (out of 82 on April FAIFA)	Co-teaching Saturday School Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed	Several of our students join Foundation drastically below grade level. As our numbers show, our students' reading levels improved over the year, but there is still work to do. Co-teachers have supported struggling readers as they

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

	2014)	2015)		provided reading remediation in targeted small groups. Saturday school has provided the lowest performing students additional opportunity for improvement in ELA. This year's 6 th grade improved from 44 below proficient in 2013-14 to 36 below proficient in 2014-15. There is still work to be done to close the achievement gap at this level.
Grade 7	39 (out of 82 on April FAIFA 2014)	29 (out of 58 on April FAIFA 2015)	Co-teaching Saturday School Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed	Several of our students join Foundation drastically below grade level. As our numbers show, our students' reading levels improved over the year, but there is still work to do. Co-teachers have supported struggling readers as they provided reading remediation in targeted small groups. Saturday school has provided the lowest performing students additional opportunity for improvement in ELA. This year's 7 th grade did not improve from 2013-14 to 2014-15. It is unclear why students did not perform as well this past year as the year before. Our benchmark assessments have been undergoing a revision process to better align the tests to the Common Core State Standards. Part of the decrease in improvement may be due to an increased rigor in the assessments. There is still work to be done to close the achievement gap at this level.
Grade 8	13 (out of 52 on April FAIFA 2014)	56 (out of 90 on April FAIFA 2015)	Co-teaching Saturday School Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed	Several of our students join Foundation drastically below grade level. As our numbers show, our students' reading levels improved over the year, but there is still work to do. Co-teachers have supported struggling readers as they provided reading remediation in targeted small groups. Saturday school has provided the lowest performing students additional opportunity for improvement in ELA. This year's 8 th grade did not improve from 2013-14 to 2014-15. It is unclear why students did not perform as well this past year as the year before. Our benchmark assessments have been undergoing a revision process to better align the tests to the Common Core State Standards. Part of the decrease in improvement may be due to an increased rigor in the assessments. There is still

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

				work to be done to close the achievement gap at this level.
Grade 11	29 (out of 54 on April FAIFA 2014)	47 (out of 57 on April FAIFA 2015)	Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed	Several of our students join Foundation drastically below grade level. It is unclear why students did not perform as well this past year as the year before. Our benchmark assessments have been undergoing a revision process to better align the tests to the Common Core State Standards. Part of the decrease in improvement may be due to an increased rigor in the assessments. There is still work to be done to close the achievement gap at this level.
Grade 12	9 (out of 13 on April FAIFA 2014)	20 (out of 48 on April FAIFA 2015)	Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed	Several of our students join Foundation drastically below grade level. It is unclear why students did not perform as well this past year as the year before. Our benchmark assessments have been undergoing a revision process to better align the tests to the Common Core State Standards. Part of the decrease in improvement may be due to an increased rigor in the assessments. There is still work to be done to close the achievement gap at this level.

Mathematics	2013-2014	2014-2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions <i>did or did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 4	N/A	56 (out of 78 on April FAIFA 2015)	Co-teaching Saturday School Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed	Several of our students join Foundation drastically below grade level. Co-teachers have supported students struggling with math as they provided math remediation in targeted small groups. Saturday school has provided the lowest performing students additional opportunity for improvement in math. There is still work to be done to close the achievement gap at this level.
Grade 5	50 (out of 86 on April FAIFA 2014)	38 (out of 81 on April FAIFA 2015)	Co-teaching Saturday School Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed	Several of our students join Foundation drastically below grade level. Co-teachers have supported students struggling with math as they provided math remediation in targeted small groups. Saturday school has provided the lowest performing students additional opportunity for improvement in math. It is unclear why students did not perform as well this past year as the year before. Our

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

				benchmark assessments have been undergoing a revision process to better align the tests to the Common Core State Standards. Part of the decrease in improvement may be due to an increased rigor in the assessments. There is still work to be done to close the achievement gap at this level.
Grade 6	43 (out of 58 on April FAIFA 2014)	60 (out of 84 on April FAIFA 2015)	Co-teaching Saturday School Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed	Several of our students join Foundation drastically below grade level. Co-teachers have supported students struggling with math as they provided math remediation in targeted small groups. Saturday school has provided the lowest performing students additional opportunity for improvement in math. It is unclear why students did not perform as well this past year as the year before. Our benchmark assessments have been undergoing a revision process to better align the tests to the Common Core State Standards. Part of the decrease in improvement may be due to an increased rigor in the assessments. There is still work to be done to close the achievement gap at this level.
Grade 7	40 (out of 80 on April FAIFA 2014)	49 (out of 58 on April FAIFA 2015)	Co-teaching Saturday School Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed	Several of our students join Foundation drastically below grade level. Co-teachers have supported students struggling with math as they provided math remediation in targeted small groups. Saturday school has provided the lowest performing students additional opportunity for improvement in math. It is unclear why students did not perform as well this past year as the year before. Our benchmark assessments have been undergoing a revision process to better align the tests to the Common Core State Standards. Part of the decrease in improvement may be due to an increased rigor in the assessments. There is still work to be done to close the achievement gap at this level.
Grade 8	30 (out of 53 on April FAIFA 2014)	58 (out of 90 on April FAIFA 2015)	Co-teaching Saturday School Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed	Several of our students join Foundation drastically below grade level. Co-teachers have supported students struggling with math as they provided math remediation in targeted small groups. Saturday school has provided the lowest performing students additional opportunity for improvement in math. It is unclear why students did not

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

				perform as well this past year as the year before. Our benchmark assessments have been undergoing a revision process to better align the tests to the Common Core State Standards. Part of the decrease in improvement may be due to an increased rigor in the assessments. There is still work to be done to close the achievement gap at this level.
Grade 11	34 (out of 54 on April FAIFA 2014)	46 (out of 56 on April FAIFA 2015)	Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed	Several of our students join Foundation drastically below grade level. It is unclear why students did not perform as well this past year as the year before. Our benchmark assessments have been undergoing a revision process to better align the tests to the Common Core State Standards. Part of the decrease in improvement may be due to an increased rigor in the assessments. There is still work to be done to close the achievement gap at this level.
Grade 12	11 (out of 12 on April FAIFA 2014)	39 (out of 43 on April FAIFA 2015, data not available for 6 students)	Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed	Several of our students join Foundation drastically below grade level. It is unclear why students did not perform as well this past year as the year before. Our benchmark assessments have been undergoing a revision process to better align the tests to the Common Core State Standards. Part of the decrease in improvement may be due to an increased rigor in the assessments. There is still work to be done to close the achievement gap at this level.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Student Performance *Non-Tested Grades – Alternative Assessments (Below Level)*

Provide the number of students at each non-tested grade level listed below who performed below level on a standardized and/or developmentally appropriate assessment, and the interventions the students received.

English Language Arts	2013 - 2014	2014 -2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions <i>did</i> or <i>did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Pre-Kindergarten	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kindergarten	N/A	15 (out of 77 on May STEP Reading Assessment)	Co-teaching Saturday School Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed	Several of our students join Foundation drastically below grade level. Co-teachers have supported students struggling with ELA as they provided reading remediation in targeted small groups. Saturday school has provided the lowest performing students additional opportunity for improvement in ELA. There is still work to be done to close the achievement gap at this level.
Grade 1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 9	20 (out of 65 on April FAIFA 2014)	66 (out of 75 on April FAIFA 2015)	Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed	Several of our students join Foundation drastically below grade level. It is unclear why students did not perform as well this past year as the year before. Our benchmark assessments have been undergoing a revision process to better align the tests to the Common Core State Standards. Part of the decrease in improvement may be due to an increased rigor in the assessments. There is still work to be done to close the achievement gap at this level.
Grade 10	18 (out of 54 on April FAIFA 2014)	55 (out of 64 on April FAIFA 2015)	Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed	Several of our students join Foundation drastically below grade level. It is unclear why students did not perform as well this past year as the year before. Our benchmark assessments have been undergoing a revision process to better align the tests to the Common Core State Standards. Part of the decrease

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

				in improvement may be due to an increased rigor in the assessments. There is still work to be done to close the achievement gap at this level.
--	--	--	--	--

Mathematics	2013 - 2014	2014 -2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions provided <u>did or did not</u> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Pre-Kindergarten	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kindergarten	N/A	5 (out of 77 on April FAIFA 2015)	Co-teaching Saturday School Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed	Several of our students join Foundation drastically below grade level. Co-teachers have supported students struggling with math as they provided reading remediation in targeted small groups. Saturday school has provided the lowest performing students additional opportunity for improvement in math. There is still work to be done to close the achievement gap at this level.
Grade 1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 9	59 (out of 60 on April FAIFA 2014)	51 (out of 73 on April FAIFA 2015)	Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed	Several of our students join Foundation drastically below grade level. The 9 th grade in 2014-15 has improved compared to the 9 th grade in 2013-14 (30% proficiency in 2014-15 compared to 1.6% proficiency in 2013-14). Although the 9 th grade in 2013-14 and the 9 th grade in 2014-15 are two different groups of students, the improvement may indicate that our math program for 9 th grade has improved. There is still work to be done to close the achievement gap at this level.
Grade 10	41 (out of 53 on April FAIFA 2014)	47 (out of 57 on April FAIFA 2015)	Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed	Several of our students join Foundation drastically below grade level. This year's 10 th grade improved from 59 below proficient in 2013-14 to 47 below proficient in 2014-15. While there has been some improvement, our students would benefit from increased support in math. There is still work to be done to close the achievement gap at this level.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Interventions and Strategies

Interventions to Increase Student Achievement – Implemented in 2014-2015

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	<p>Our student population is considered “high risk”. Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified interest groups.</p> <p>Co-teaching Saturday School Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed</p>	Yes	<p>STAR Reading assessments</p> <p>STEP Reading assessments</p> <p>FAIFA performance</p>	<p>The effectiveness of the interventions this year is most evident in the gains our students made in reading. According to STAR Reading results from April 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 81% of Kindergarten is reading on grade level (STEP Reading Assessment) - 3rd Grade: 77% on grade level; 2% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 4th Grade: 44% on grade level; 23% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 5th Grade: 46% on grade level; 15% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 6th Grade: 36% on grade level; 18% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 7th Grade: 31% on grade level; 36% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 8th Grade: 22% on grade level; 42% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more <p>We have had mixed success in literacy on our PARCC aligned benchmarks with the greatest need occurring at the high school. According to our April 2015 literacy FAIFA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 59% of 3rd grade is proficient - 31% of 4th grade is proficient - 47% of 5th grade is proficient - 56% of 6th grade is proficient - 50% of 7th grade is proficient

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 38% of 8th grade is proficient - 12% of 9th grade is proficient - 14% of 10th grade is proficient - 18% of 11th grade is proficient - 58% of 12th grade is proficient
Math	Students with Disabilities	<p>Our student population is considered “high risk”. Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified interest groups.</p> <p>Co-teaching Saturday School Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed</p>	Yes	FAIFA performance	<p>We have had mixed success in math on our PARCC aligned benchmarks with the greatest need occurring at the high school. According to our April 2015 math FAIFA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 55% of 3rd grade is proficient - 28% of 4th grade is proficient - 53% of 5th grade is proficient - 33% of 6th grade is proficient - 16% of 7th grade is proficient - 36% of 8th grade is proficient - 12% of 9th grade is proficient - 14% of 10th grade is proficient - 18% of 11th grade is proficient - 9% of 12th grade is proficient
ELA	Homeless	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	ELLs	Co-teaching Saturday School Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed	Yes	STAR Reading assessments STEP Reading assessments FAIFA performance	Same as above
Math	ELLs	Co-teaching Saturday School Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed	Yes	FAIFA performance	Same as above
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Co-teaching Saturday School Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed Tutoring as needed	Yes	STAR Reading assessments STEP Reading assessments FAIFA performance	Same as above
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Co-teaching Saturday School Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed	Yes	FAIFA performance	Same as above
ELA	Our student population is considered "high	Co-teaching Saturday School Extended school	Yes	STAR Reading assessments STEP Reading	Same as above

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
	risk". Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified interest groups.	year and day Tutoring as needed		Assessments FAIFA performance	
Math	Our student population is considered "high risk". Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified interest groups.	Co-teaching Saturday School Extended school year and day Tutoring as needed	Yes	FAIFA performance	Same as above

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Extended Day/Year Interventions – Implemented in 2014-2015 to Address Academic Deficiencies

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Our student population is considered “high risk”. Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified interest groups. Saturday school tutoring 200 day school year	Yes	STAR Reading assessments STEP Reading assessments FAIFA performance	<p>The effectiveness of the interventions this year is most evident in the gains our students made in reading. According to STAR Reading results from April 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 81% of Kindergarten is reading on grade level (STEP Reading Assessment) - 3rd Grade: 77% on grade level; 2% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 4th Grade: 44% on grade level; 23% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 5th Grade: 46% on grade level; 15% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 6th Grade: 36% on grade level; 18% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 7th Grade: 31% on grade level; 36% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 8th Grade: 22% on grade level; 42% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more <p>We have had mixed success in literacy on our PARCC aligned benchmarks with the greatest need occurring at the high school. According to our April 2015 literacy FAIFA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 59% of 3rd grade is proficient - 31% of 4th grade is proficient - 47% of 5th grade is proficient - 56% of 6th grade is proficient - 50% of 7th grade is proficient - 38% of 8th grade is proficient - 12% of 9th grade is proficient

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 14% of 10th grade is proficient - 18% of 11th grade is proficient - 58% of 12th grade is proficient
Math	Students with Disabilities	Our student population is considered “high risk”. Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified interest groups. Saturday school tutoring 200 day school year	Yes	FAIFA performance	<p>We have had mixed success in math on our PARCC aligned benchmarks with the greatest need occurring at the high school. According to our April 2015 math FAIFA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 55% of 3rd grade is proficient - 28% of 4th grade is proficient - 53% of 5th grade is proficient - 33% of 6th grade is proficient - 16% of 7th grade is proficient - 36% of 8th grade is proficient - 12% of 9th grade is proficient - 14% of 10th grade is proficient - 18% of 11th grade is proficient - 9% of 12th grade is proficient
ELA	Homeless	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLs	Same as above	Yes	Same as above	Same as above

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
Math	ELLs	Same as above	Yes	Same as above	Same as above
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Same as above	Yes	Same as above	Same as above
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Same as above	Yes	Same as above	Same as above
ELA	Same as above	Same as above	Yes	Same as above	Same as above
Math	Same as above	Same as above	Yes	Same as above	Same as above

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Interventions and Strategies

Professional Development – Implemented in 2014-2015

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Teacher Boot Camp Data Day	Yes	FAIFA performance	<p>During Teacher Boot Camp, teachers learn instructional strategies to use during the year. Throughout the year, there were 4 Data Days that occur the day after FAIFAs during which teachers analyze the FAIFA data and develop reteach plans for particular standards and students. This reteach process has been effective for bringing up the overall achievement of 3rd through 8th grade. According to the literacy FAIFA data in 2014-15:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3rd grade improved (mean 36% in October and 60% in April) - 4th grade improved (mean 46% in October and 47% in April) - 5th grade improved (mean 45% in October and 52% in April) - 6th grade improved (mean 47% in October and 54% in April) - 7th grade had no change (mean 54% in October and 54% in April) - 8th grade had almost no change (mean 50% in October and 49% in April) <p>Due to a drastic increase in the rigor of the high school literacy FAIFAs, scores at the end of the year appeared to decline from the scores in October. This shows that we need to increase support for ELA at the high school level in addition to realigning the FAIFAs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 9th grade: mean 56% in October and 42% in April

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 10th grade: mean 54% in October and 39% in April - 11th grade: mean 53% in October and 40% in April - 12th grade: mean 65% in October and 62% in April
Math	Students with Disabilities	Teacher Boot Camp Data Day	Yes	FAIFA performance	<p>During Teacher Boot Camp, teachers learn instructional strategies to use during the year. Throughout the year, there were 4 Data Days that occur the day after FAIFAs during which teachers analyze the FAIFA data and develop reteach plans for particular standards and students. This reteach process has been mostly effective for bringing up the overall achievement of 3rd through 8th grade. According to the math FAIFA data in 2014-15:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3rd grade improved (mean 41% in October and 55% in April) - 4th grade declined (mean 56% in October and 44% in April) - 5th grade improved (mean 48% in October and 55% in April) - 6th grade improved (mean 41% in October and 48% in April) - 7th grade improved (mean 33% in October and 34% in April) - 8th grade improved (mean 32% in October and 52% in April) <p>At the high school, 2014-15 FAIFA data shows improvement in Algebra I and Algebra II.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Algebra I students improved (mean 34% in October

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and 43% in April) - Geometry students declined (mean 38% in October and 31% in April) - Algebra II students improved (mean 35% in October and 48% in April)
ELA	Homeless	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLs	Same as above	Yes	Same as above	Same as above
Math	ELLs	Same as above	Yes	Same as above	Same as above
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Same as above	Yes	Same as above	Same as above
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Same as above	Yes	Same as above	Same as above
ELA	Our student population is considered "high risk". Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified	Same as above	Yes	Same as above	Same as above

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
	interest groups.				
Math	Our student population is considered “high risk”. Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified interest groups.	Same as above	Yes	Same as above	Same as above

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Family and Community Engagement Implemented in 2014-2015

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities Our student population is considered “high risk”. Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified interest groups.	FACT Partnership Meetings Parent Teacher Conferences Parent Surveys	Yes	Tracking parent/guardian participation at town hall meetings and provide suggestions cards. Parent surveys to assess satisfaction and to collect suggestions for improvement. Meeting with parents/guardians regarding student achievement and needs. Tracking parent/guardian participation parent teacher conferences.	Parent satisfaction with the school and participation in family events show that family engagement efforts have been effective. According to the April 2015 Parent Survey, 94% of parent reported that they were satisfied with the school which was an increase in satisfaction from the rate at beginning of the year of 90% satisfaction. During Parent Teacher Conferences in April 2015, 89% of parents attended. Since our student population is considered “high risk,” we use similar strategies for ELA and math for all of the identified interest groups.
Math	Students with Disabilities Our student population is considered “high risk”. Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified	FACT Partnership Meetings Parent Teacher Conferences Parent Surveys	Yes	Tracking parent/guardian participation at town hall meetings and provide suggestions cards. Parent surveys to assess satisfaction and to collect	Parent satisfaction with the school and participation in family events show that family engagement efforts have been effective. According to the April 2015 Parent Survey, 94% of parent reported that they were satisfied with the school which was an increase in satisfaction from the rate at beginning of the year of 90% satisfaction. During Parent Teacher Conferences in April 2015, 89% of parents attended. Since our student population is considered “high risk,” we use similar strategies for ELA and math for all of the identified interest groups.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
	interest groups.			suggestions for improvement. Meeting with parents/guardians regarding student achievement and needs. Tracking parent/guardian participation parent teacher conferences.	
ELA	Homeless	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLs	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
Math	ELLs	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
Math	Economically	Same as above	Same as	Same as above	Same as above

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
	Disadvantaged		above		
ELA	Schoolwide Our student population is considered “high risk”. Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified interest groups.	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
Math	Schoolwide Our student population is considered “high risk”. Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified interest groups.	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

Principal's Certification

The following certification must be completed by the principal of the school. Please Note: Signatures must be kept on file at the school. A scanned copy of the Evaluation form, with all appropriate signatures, must be included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

☒ I certify that the school's stakeholder/schoolwide committee conducted and completed the required Title I schoolwide evaluation as required for the completion of this Title I Schoolwide Plan. Per this evaluation, I concur with the information herein, including the identification of all programs and activities that were funded by Title I, Part A.

Sheria Andrews
Principal's Name (Print)

On File
Principal's Signature

6/30/2015
Date

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(A): "A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school [including taking into account the needs of migratory children as defined in §1309(2)] that is based on information which includes the achievement of children in relation to the State academic content standards and the State student academic achievement standards described in §1111(b)(1). "

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process *Data Collection and Analysis*

Multiple Measures Analyzed by the School in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process for 2015-2016

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
Academic Achievement – Reading	STAR Reading, FAIFA performance	<p>The effectiveness of the interventions this year is most evident in the gains our students made in reading. According to STAR Reading results from April 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 81% of Kindergarten is reading on grade level (STEP Reading Assessment) - 3rd Grade: 77% on grade level; 2% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 4th Grade: 44% on grade level; 23% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 5th Grade: 46% on grade level; 15% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 6th Grade: 36% on grade level; 18% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 7th Grade: 31% on grade level; 36% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 8th Grade: 22% on grade level; 42% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more <p>We have had mixed success in literacy on our PARCC aligned benchmarks with the greatest need occurring at the high school. According to our April 2015 literacy FAIFA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 59% of 3rd grade is proficient

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 31% of 4th grade is proficient - 47% of 5th grade is proficient - 56% of 6th grade is proficient - 50% of 7th grade is proficient - 38% of 8th grade is proficient - 12% of 9th grade is proficient - 14% of 10th grade is proficient - 18% of 11th grade is proficient - 58% of 12th grade is proficient
Academic Achievement - Writing	FAIFA performance	<p>We have had mixed success in literacy on our PARCC aligned benchmarks with the greatest need occurring at the high school. According to our April 2015 literacy FAIFA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 59% of 3rd grade is proficient - 31% of 4th grade is proficient - 47% of 5th grade is proficient - 56% of 6th grade is proficient - 50% of 7th grade is proficient - 38% of 8th grade is proficient - 12% of 9th grade is proficient - 14% of 10th grade is proficient - 18% of 11th grade is proficient - 58% of 12th grade is proficient
Academic Achievement - Mathematics	FAIFA performance	<p>We have had mixed success in math on our PARCC aligned benchmarks with the greatest need occurring at the high school. According to our April 2015 math FAIFA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3rd grade improved (mean 41% in October and 55% in April) - 4th grade declined (mean 56% in October and 44% in April) - 5th grade improved (mean 48% in October and 55% in April) - 6th grade improved (mean 41% in October and 48% in April) - 7th grade improved (mean 33% in October and 34% in April)

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 8th grade improved (mean 32% in October and 52% in April) <p>At the high school, 2014-15 FAIFA data shows improvement in Algebra I and Algebra II.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Algebra I students improved (mean 34% in October and 43% in April) - Geometry students declined (mean 38% in October and 31% in April) - Algebra II students improved (mean 35% in October and 48% in April)
Family and Community Engagement	Parent Satisfaction Rate Parent Participation in Academic Events	96% parent satisfaction (Spring 2015) 89% parent participation in Parent Teacher Conferences (Spring 2015)
Professional Development	Teacher Retention	71% of 2014-15 teachers are returning in 2015-16
Leadership	Leadership Experience	CEO: 9 years of experience Principals: 4 years, 3 years, 1 year of experience
School Climate and Culture	Student Surveys Teacher Retention Teacher/Staff Surveys	66% student satisfaction, 72% report that school is safe (Spring 2015) 71% of 2014-15 teachers are returning in 2015-16
School-Based Youth Services	After school mentoring for our most challenging students.	Mixed results with improved student behavior.
Students with Disabilities	School Information System – School Brains	79 students with IEPs 10.4% students with IEPs
Homeless Students	School Information System – School Brains	0 homeless students 0% homeless students
Migrant Students	School Information System – School Brains	0 migrant students 0% migrant students

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
English Language Learners	School Information System – School Brains	28 LEP students 3.7% LEP students
Economically Disadvantaged	School Information System – School Brains	630 students with free/reduced lunch 82.9% students with free/reduced lunch

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process*

Narrative

1. What process did the school use to conduct its Comprehensive Needs Assessment?

The Title 1 Committee, representative of all stakeholders, looked at our internal benchmark assessment results (FAIFAs) and STAR Reading scores and provided their input from experience to decide our primary needs. Additional analysis came from academic support team, Chief Executive Officer, Principals, and school leaders.

2. What process did the school use to collect and compile data for student subgroups?

We calculated the proficiency scores on FAIFAs using a cutoff of 55% or better for proficiency for grades 3 through 8 and 60% or better for proficiency for grades 9 through 12.

3. How does the school ensure that the data used in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process are valid (measures what it is designed to measure) and reliable (yields consistent results)?

For data on reading grade levels, we used STAR Reading assessments for grades 3 through 8, which is data that is very reliable since the assessments are widely used to determine reading levels. For other literacy data and math data, we have had to rely mostly on our internal benchmark assessments (FAIFAs) for data since there has been a transition to PARCC as the state assessment and we have not yet received PARCC results. The goal is that FAIFAs be aligned to Common Core State Standards and mirror the rigor of the PARCC assessments. Each year, we revise them to increase validity and reliability, but there is still room for growth on the assessments. The reliability of FAIFAs is also affected by the expansion of the school and the opening of new grade levels. We have hired writers to write FAIFAs, and we anticipate that it will take several iterations and revisions for the tests to be truly reliable. Even though there are some limitations in the current FAIFAs, the data is still informative for planning interventions for our students.

4. What did the data analysis reveal regarding classroom instruction?

Students come to Foundation Academies already below grade level, and while we see improvements in some of the grade levels, many of our students are still performing below grade average in reading, ELA, and math. According to our STAR Reading assessments, we did see improvement in the majority of our 3rd through 8th grade in reading, which indicates that our reading interventions have been effective.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

5. What did the data analysis reveal regarding professional development implemented in the previous year(s)?

The data reveals our staff needs continued professional development in reading, ELA, and math instruction especially in the areas of implementing effective instructional strategies and remediation. The data shows that the Data Days that we implemented in 2014-15 were mostly effective for formulating reteach plans and identifying students for additional help like Saturday School.

6. How does the school identify educationally at-risk students in a timely manner?

Students are asked to take an assessment test prior to entering our school. This data is used to group students for additional help like Saturday School and for other small group interventions. Students' academic achievement and appropriate supports was reevaluated 4 times throughout the year to ensure that we were helping the students who were struggling in ELA and math.

7. How does the school provide effective interventions to educationally at-risk students?

Students receive additional after-school tutoring and Saturday school with our teachers so that they can catch up. Students are identified for extra help using FAIFAs.

8. How does the school address the needs of migrant students?

N/A – We did not have any migrant students.

9. How does the school address the needs of homeless students?

In Fall 2014, we had one student who was homeless for a time. Our homeless liaison reached out to the family immediately and secured transportation to and from school for the student. The homeless liaison also ensured that the student had all of the necessary supplies for school. After checking in frequently, we learned that the student was no longer homeless. We now do not have any homeless students.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

- 10.** How does the school engage its teachers in decisions regarding the use of academic assessments to provide information on and improve the instructional program?

Teachers are engaged in decisions regarding the use of academic assessments in Teacher Boot Camp at the beginning of the school year, in monthly staff and department meetings, and during one-on-one conversations with the school principals. Boot-camp is what Foundation Academy calls the intensive two-week teacher training period prior to the beginning of the school year. During Data Days, teachers also analyze results from 4 rounds of internal benchmark assessments (FAIFAs) and create reteach plans based on the standards and skills their students still need to master.

- 11.** How does the school help students transition from preschool to kindergarten, elementary to middle school, and/or middle to high school?

Students who are new to the organization attend new student orientation for two days before the official first day of school. In order to help with major transitions from 5th grade to 6th grade and 8th grade to 9th grade, teachers meet the students they will be in the coming year and provide students with information about how to be successful at the next academic level. We also held parent information nights for incoming kindergarteners and for students moving up to a new school.

- 12.** How did the school select the priority problems and root causes for the 2015-2016 schoolwide plan?

The Title 1 Committee, in evaluating the needs, looked at our state assessments and upon discussion of each need, found that closing the achievement gap in ELA and math captured our other needs and chose it as our main priority.

****Provide a separate response for each question.***

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process *Description of Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them*

Based upon the school's needs assessment, select at least three (3) priority problems that will be addressed in this plan. Complete the information below for each priority problem.

	#1	#2
Name of priority problem	Closing the Achievement Gap	Language Arts Literacy and Reading
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	<p>The effectiveness of the interventions this year is most evident in the gains our students made in reading. According to STAR Reading results from April 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 81% of Kindergarten is reading on grade level (STEP Reading Assessment) - 3rd Grade: 77% on grade level; 2% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 4th Grade: 44% on grade level; 23% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 5th Grade: 46% on grade level; 15% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 6th Grade: 36% on grade level; 18% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 7th Grade: 31% on grade level; 36% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 8th Grade: 22% on grade level; 42% of students not on grade level increased by a 	<p>The effectiveness of the interventions this year is most evident in the gains our students made in reading. According to STAR Reading results from April 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 81% of Kindergarten is reading on grade level (STEP Reading Assessment) - 3rd Grade: 77% on grade level; 2% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 4th Grade: 44% on grade level; 23% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 5th Grade: 46% on grade level; 15% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 6th Grade: 36% on grade level; 18% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 7th Grade: 31% on grade level; 36% of students not on grade level increased by a level or more - 8th Grade: 22% on grade level; 42% of students not on grade level increased by a

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

	<p style="text-align: center;">level or more</p> <p>We have had mixed success in literacy on our PARCC aligned benchmarks with the greatest need occurring at the high school. According to our April 2015 literacy FAIFA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 59% of 3rd grade is proficient - 31% of 4th grade is proficient - 47% of 5th grade is proficient - 56% of 6th grade is proficient - 50% of 7th grade is proficient - 38% of 8th grade is proficient - 12% of 9th grade is proficient - 14% of 10th grade is proficient - 18% of 11th grade is proficient - 58% of 12th grade is proficient <p>We have had mixed success in math on our PARCC aligned benchmarks with the greatest need occurring at the high school. According to our April 2015 math FAIFA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3rd grade improved (mean 41% in October and 55% in April) - 4th grade declined (mean 56% in October and 44% in April) - 5th grade improved (mean 48% in October and 55% in April) - 6th grade improved (mean 41% in October and 48% in April) - 7th grade improved (mean 33% in October and 34% in April) - 8th grade improved (mean 32% in October and 52% in April) <p>At the high school, 2014-15 FAIFA data shows improvement in Algebra I and Algebra II.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">level or more</p> <p>We have had mixed success in literacy on our PARCC aligned benchmarks with the greatest need occurring at the high school. According to our April 2015 literacy FAIFA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 59% of 3rd grade is proficient - 31% of 4th grade is proficient - 47% of 5th grade is proficient - 56% of 6th grade is proficient - 50% of 7th grade is proficient - 38% of 8th grade is proficient - 12% of 9th grade is proficient - 14% of 10th grade is proficient - 18% of 11th grade is proficient <p>58% of 12th grade is proficient</p>
--	--	--

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Algebra I students improved (mean 34% in October and 43% in April) - Geometry students declined (mean 38% in October and 31% in April) - Algebra II students improved (mean 35% in October and 48% in April) 	
Describe the root causes of the problem	Our school traditionally began in the 5th grade (this past Fall we extended down to K this year- Fall 2014) and a large majority of our students come to us already below grade level in English and Language Arts and in Math.	Our school traditionally began in the 5th grade (this past Fall we extended down to K this year- Fall 2014) and a large majority of our students come to us already below grade level in English and Language Arts and in Math.
Subgroups or populations addressed	All	All
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	A majority of our students come to us already below grade level in English and Language Arts and in Math. Students at all grade levels are behind in English and Language Arts and in Math.	A majority of our students come to us already below grade level in English and Language Arts and in Math. Students at all grade levels are behind in English and Language Arts and in Math.
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Extended year, extended day, supplementary tutoring, and additional in-class support.	Extended year, extended day, supplementary tutoring, and additional in-class support.
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	The Common Core State standards are rigorous standards in English Language Arts and Math. The above interventions promote rigorous teaching and learning and we assess the success of the interventions with rigorous, Common Core aligned, tests (FAIFAs).	The Common Core State standards are rigorous standards in English Language Arts and Math. The above interventions promote rigorous teaching and learning and we assess the success of the interventions with rigorous, Common Core aligned, tests (FAIFAs).

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process Description of Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them (continued)

	#3	#4
Name of priority problem	Mathematics	
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	<p>We have had mixed success in math on our PARCC aligned benchmarks with the greatest need occurring at the high school. According to our April 2015 math FAIFA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3rd grade improved (mean 41% in October and 55% in April) - 4th grade declined (mean 56% in October and 44% in April) - 5th grade improved (mean 48% in October and 55% in April) - 6th grade improved (mean 41% in October and 48% in April) - 7th grade improved (mean 33% in October and 34% in April) - 8th grade improved (mean 32% in October and 52% in April) <p>At the high school, 2014-15 FAIFA data shows improvement in Algebra I and Algebra II.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Algebra I students improved (mean 34% in October and 43% in April) - Geometry students declined (mean 38% in October and 31% in April) - Algebra II students improved (mean 35% in October and 48% in April) 	

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Describe the root causes of the problem	Our school traditionally began in the 5th grade (this past Fall we extended down to K this year- Fall 2014) and a large majority of our students come to us already below grade level in English and Language Arts and in Math.	
Subgroups or populations addressed	All	
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	A majority of our students come to us already below grade level in English and Language Arts and in Math. Students at all grade levels are behind in English and Language Arts and in Math.	
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Extended year, extended day, supplementary tutoring, and additional in-class support.	
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	The Common Core State standards are rigorous standards in English Language Arts and Math. The above interventions promote rigorous teaching and learning and we assess the success of the interventions with rigorous, Common Core aligned, tests (FAIFAs).	

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)

ESEA §1114(b) Components of a Schoolwide Program: A schoolwide program shall include . . . schoolwide reform strategies that . . . “

2015-2016 Interventions to Address Student Achievement

<i>ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;</i>					
Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities Our student population is considered “high risk”. Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified interest groups.	Summer Academy* Saturday School Small group reading and co-teaching of reading	Principal Reading and ELA teachers	STAR Reading Assessments FAIFA performance	“Assisting Students Struggling with Reading,” IES Practice Guide, What Works Clearinghouse, 2009
Math	Students with Disabilities Our student population is considered “high risk”. Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified interest groups.	Summer Academy* After School Math Remediation* Saturday School Co-teaching of math	Principal Math teachers b-Fair Tutoring	FAIFA performance	“Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics,” IES Practice Guide, What Works Clearinghouse, 2009
ELA	Homeless	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	No students in this	N/A	N/A	N/A

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

<i>ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;</i>					
Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
		group			
Math	Migrant	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLs	Same as above	Principal ESL teacher ELA teachers	Same as above	"Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades." IES Practice Guide, What Works Clearinghouse, 2007.
Math	ELLs	Same as above	Principal ESL teacher Math teachers	Same as above	"Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades." IES Practice Guide, What Works Clearinghouse, 2007.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Same as above	Principal Reading and ELA teachers	Same as above	"Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective classroom and Intervention Practices" IES Practice Guide, What Works Clearinghouse, 2008. Page 7 cites "strong" evidence of effectiveness of making "available intensive and individualized interventions for struggling readers that can be provided by trained specialists."
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Same as above	Principal Math teachers	Same as above	"Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle School" IES Practice Guide, What Works Clearinghouse, 2009.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

<i>ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;</i>					
Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Our student population is considered “high risk”. Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified interest groups.	Same as above	Principal Reading and ELA teachers	Same as above	“Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective classroom and Intervention Practices” IES Practice Guide, What Works Clearinghouse, 2008. Page 7 cites “strong” evidence of effectiveness of making “available intensive and individualized interventions for struggling readers that can be provided by trained specialists.”
Math	Our student population is considered “high risk”. Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified interest groups.	Same as above	Principal Math teachers	Same as above	“Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle School” IES Practice Guide, What Works Clearinghouse, 2009.

**Use an asterisk to denote new programs.*

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)

2015-2016 Extended Learning Time and Extended Day/Year Interventions to Address Student Achievement

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities Our student population is considered “high risk”. Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified interest groups.	Summer Academy* Saturday School After school tutoring 200 day school year	Principal Reading and ELA teachers	STAR Reading Assessments FAIFA performance	“Structuring Out of School Time to Improve Academic Achievement”, IES Practice Guide, What Works Clearinghouse, 2009.
Math	Students with Disabilities Our student population is considered “high risk”. Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified interest groups.	Summer Academy* After School Math Remediation* Saturday School After school tutoring 200 day school year	Principal Math teachers b-Fair Tutoring	FAIFA performance	“Structuring Out of School Time to Improve Academic Achievement”, IES Practice Guide, What Works Clearinghouse, 2009.
ELA	Homeless	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
Math	Migrant	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLs	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
Math	ELLs	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
ELA	Our student population is considered “high risk”. Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified interest groups.	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
Math	Our student population is considered “high risk”. Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified interest groups.	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above

****Use an asterisk to denote new programs.***

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)

2015-2016 Professional Development to Address Student Achievement and Priority Problems

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities Our student population is considered "high risk". Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified interest groups.	Teacher Boot Camp Data Day Supplemental PD opportunities throughout the year.	Principals	STAR Reading Assessments FAIFA performance	"Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices" IES Practice Guide, What Works Clearinghouse, 2008. Page 7 cites "strong" evidence of effectiveness of making "available intensive and individualized interventions for struggling readers that can be provided by trained specialists."
Math	Students with Disabilities	Teacher Boot Camp Data Day Supplemental PD opportunities throughout the year.	Principals	FAIFA performance	"Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices" IES Practice Guide, What Works Clearinghouse, 2008. Page 7 cites "strong" evidence of effectiveness of making "available intensive and individualized interventions for struggling readers that can be provided by trained specialists."
ELA	Homeless	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Migrant	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLs	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
Math	ELLs	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
ELA	Our student population is considered "high risk". Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified interest groups.	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
Math	Our student population is considered "high risk". Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
	interest groups.				

**Use an asterisk to denote new programs.*

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)

24 CFR § 200.26(c): Core Elements of a Schoolwide Program (Evaluation). A school operating a schoolwide program must—(1) Annually evaluate the implementation of, and results achieved by, the schoolwide program, using data from the State's annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement; (2) Determine whether the schoolwide program has been effective in increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students who had been furthest from achieving the standards; and (3) Revise the plan, as necessary, based on the results of the evaluation, to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program.

Evaluation of Schoolwide Program*

(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program beginning in the 2015-2016 school year)

All Title I schoolwide programs must conduct an annual evaluation to determine if the strategies in the schoolwide plan are achieving the planned outcomes and contributing to student achievement. Schools must evaluate the implementation of their schoolwide program and the outcomes of their schoolwide program.

1. Who will be responsible for evaluating the schoolwide program for 2015-2016? Will the review be conducted internally (by school staff), or externally? How frequently will evaluation take place?

Our Title I committee is representative of all stakeholders (teachers, students, administrators, parents, community members). The review will be conducted internally by the committee and school staff.

2. What barriers or challenges does the school anticipate during the implementation process?

We do not anticipate any barriers at this time and will constantly monitor progress with both internally and externally designed academic measurement tools.

3. How will the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the program(s)?

The Title 1 Committee represents all stakeholders and will be given multiple presentations with academic (qualitative and quantitative) data, multiple discussion opportunities and the opportunity to provide necessary feedback on implementation plans. The Title I Committee was provided with background on Title I funding so that its members could actively participate in the planning process. The NCLB Coordinator collected questions, concerns, and ideas from each committee member via notecard at the Title I meetings so that every voice could be heard.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

4. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the staff?

The school uses staff and teacher surveys, staff and teacher feedback via progress reports and weekly meetings with supervisors.

5. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the community?

The school uses parent surveys, student surveys, and community partnership meetings.

6. How will the school structure interventions?

CO-TEACHING OF ELA AND MATH

Two teachers will work together to do much more than deliver the normal curriculum. The second teacher helps to decrease the teacher to student ratio, but, more importantly, identifies struggling students and delivers effective and rigorous differentiation. We will train the co-teachers to incorporate rigorous differentiation into their classrooms 95% to 100% of the time, in order to meet the needs of struggling students in ELA and mathematics. We will use co-teaching in several of our ELA and math classes leading up to high school (in grades K-8) in order to close the achievement gap before students get to high school. We believe that students need to have a strong foundation before 9th grade in order to be successful in high school. While we are focusing on improving how we prepare students for high school, we are also planning to add a co-teacher at the high school level to provide increased remediation for the students who are struggling the most.

SATURDAY SCHOOL

During Saturday School, certified teachers provide support in remediation for ELA and math. Students will be identified for the Saturday School program using our internal benchmark assessments (FAIFAs). The students who perform in the lowest third of each administration of the FAIFAs will be invited to attend Saturday School via contact with their parents/guardians. The base of the curriculum will be iReady Math and Language Arts. Teachers will use the assessments in iReady to identify students for small group and one-on-one remediation help.

SUMMER ACADEMY

Summer Academy will be a new program in which certified teachers will provide support in remediation for ELA and math. This summer program is an extension of Saturday School. Students will be identified for the Summer Academy based on the last administration of the FAIFA if they performed in the lowest third in ELA or math. The program will use iReady Math and Language Arts as its curriculum, including a diagnostic and progress monitoring assessments each week. Teachers will deliver instruction in

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)

math and reading, and use the assessments in iReady to identify students for small group and one-on-one remediation help. The program will run for 3 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day.

AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM

We will be adding an after school math remediation program at the high school for 2015-16. Students will be identified for additional math support using the FAIFAs throughout the year. We will be partnering with an organization called b-Fair Tutoring that will be implementing the after school program that consists of 1/3 skill training and remediation, 1/3 direct instruction of prerequisite skills necessary for success in the regular curriculum, and 1/3 individual tutoring and practice. Each identified student will attend the after school program once per week for 90 minutes in groups of 6-10 students.

7. How frequently will students receive instructional interventions?

Students will receive co-teaching interventions on a daily basis in several ELA and math classes. Students who are identified for Saturday School will attend from October to April, 3 days per month, 4 hours per day. Students who are identified for Saturday School will attend for 3 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day. Students who are identified for the after school program will attend 1 day per week, 90 minutes per day.

8. What resources/technologies will the school use to support the schoolwide program?

The school will use increased tech resources via advanced academic software as well as updated and new computers.

9. What quantitative data will the school use to measure the effectiveness of each intervention provided?

The school will continue to use internal benchmark assessments (FAIFAs) in addition to STAR Reading assessments to measure the effectiveness of the interventions. We will also use PARCC data to assess effectiveness once it is available.

10. How will the school disseminate the results of the schoolwide program evaluation to its stakeholder groups?

The school will share its program evaluation through annual reports, survey feedback, test data assessment reports and updates, analysis from academic support team, and presentations at Title I Committee meetings.

****Provide a separate response for each question.***

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F) Strategies to increase parental involvement in accordance with §1118, such as family literacy services

Research continues to show that successful schools have significant and sustained levels of family and community engagement. As a result, schoolwide plans must contain strategies to involve families and the community, especially in helping children do well in school. In addition, families and the community must be involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the schoolwide program.

2015-2016 Family and Community Engagement Strategies to Address Student Achievement and Priority Problems

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities Our student population is considered "high risk". Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified interest groups.	FACT Partnership Meetings Parent teacher conferences Parent surveys	Principals Reading and ELA teachers FACT president	Tracking parent/guardian participation at town hall meetings and provide suggestions cards. Parent surveys to assess satisfaction and to collect suggestions for improvement. Meeting with parents/guardians regarding student achievement and needs. Tracking parent/guardian participation parent teacher conferences.	"What Research Says About Parental Involvement in Children's Education In Relation to Academic Achievement" from the Michigan Department of Education, March 2002 Research shows that consistent communication with parents and parental involvement at the school "can have a strong influence on children's school performance."
Math	Students with Disabilities Our student population is considered "high risk". Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified	FACT Partnership Meetings Parent teacher conferences Parent surveys	Principals Math teachers FACT president	Tracking parent/guardian participation at town hall meetings and provide suggestions cards. Parent surveys to assess satisfaction and to collect suggestions for improvement. Meeting with parents/guardians regarding student achievement and needs. Tracking parent/guardian participation	"What Research Says About Parental Involvement in Children's Education In Relation to Academic Achievement" from the Michigan Department of Education, March 2002 Research shows that consistent communication with parents and parental involvement at the school "can have a strong influence on children's school performance."

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
	interest groups.			parent teacher conferences.	
ELA	Homeless	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	No students in this group	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLs	Latino Parent Night* (The above interventions also)	ESL teacher, principals	Tracking parent/guardian participation. Student admittance into colleges will not significantly differ from our overall college admittance.	Same as above
Math	ELLs	Latino Parent Night* (The above interventions also)	ESL teacher, principals	Tracking parent/guardian participation. Student admittance into colleges will not significantly differ from our overall college admittance.	Same as above
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
ELA	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
Math	Our student population is considered "high risk".	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
	Thus, we use similar strategies for all of the identified interest groups.				

**Use an asterisk to denote new programs.*

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

2015-2016 Family and Community Engagement Narrative

- 1.** How will the school's family and community engagement program help to address the priority problems identified in the comprehensive needs assessment?

Foundation Academies recognizes parents as important resources, and pays attention to creating a positive, welcoming and supportive school climate. The school offers a range of opportunities for parental involvement including Foundation Academies Council Team (FACT) parent meetings, parent/teacher conferences, and resources for supporting their students. We have high standards for our students, and parental involvement is a key component to students meeting those standards. Foundation Academies is actively engaged with the community and provides services, programs and supports for community members. It serves as a resource for community learning and partners with the community to provide resources that support student and family development.

- 2.** How will the school engage parents in the development of the written parent involvement policy?

The starting point for developing the written parent involvement policy is analyzing feedback collected from parent and student surveys. The surveys provide a breadth of experiences and ideas that help the school understand the needs of the community. The school leaders incorporate the feedback from the community when they plan family events and determine what resources to provide. The plans are influenced by school leaders, staff members, community representatives, students, and parents, and we assess the effectiveness of our plans throughout the year in order to continue improving parental involvement at the school.

- 3.** How will the school distribute its written parent involvement policy?

There are a number of major (and recurring) activities and events targeted towards parents that are held throughout the year such as Back to School Nights, Parent Teacher Conferences, musical concerts, Town Hall Meetings, and Foundation Academy Council Team (FACT/PTA) Meetings, and home visits for new students in which parents are full engaged. Parents frequent these events and the parent participation is usually very high. The written parent involvement policy will be distributed at these recurring events and will be available on the school website.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

4. How will the school engage parents in the development of the school-parent compact?

The school-parent compact will always be a work in progress as the needs of parents and students change and shift over time. In order to capture these shifts in opinion, regular surveys are given and focus groups are developed as needed.

5. How will the school ensure that parents receive and review the school-parent compact?

The school-parent compact as well as the parental involvement policy will be sent home directly along with other student forms to be filled out and returned to school. These documents will also be available during major family events such as Back to School Night and parent teacher conferences.

6. How will the school report its student achievement data to families and the community?

The school will send seasonal and monthly newsletters (in both electronic and paper form) will be sent home reporting data on student achievement.

7. How will the school notify families and the community if the district has not met its annual measurable achievement objectives

(AMAO) for Title III?

N/A

8. How will the school inform families and the community of the school's disaggregated assessment results?

The school regularly collects data about the school and community needs and student achievement and then informs families and the community on the school's assessment results by compiling it into a user friendly format for publication. This publication is made available to families and the community through email and the school website. The school's annual reports and NJ School Performance Reports are also available on the website.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)

9. How will the school involve families and the community in the development of the Title I Schoolwide Plan?

The Title I Schoolwide Plan will be developed by the school leaders and the Academic Support Team with input from the Title I Committee. In addition to the community members on the Title I Committee (which includes parents and students) who provide critical feedback and support in the development of the plan, parents and students' feedback via surveys are also considered when developing the plan. Using survey data to inform the committee's decisions ensures that we have a variety of voices.

10. How will the school inform families about the academic achievement of their child/children?

To ensure regular communication with families, Foundation Academies' teachers contact families each month to discuss student progress. Teachers review student work and test results together with parents during each quarter's parent teacher conferences. In addition, at the end of each quarter, parents are invited to attend a student awards ceremony in which student achievement and progress is noted and celebrated.

11. On what specific strategies will the school use its 2015-2016 parent involvement funds?

The school plans to use parent involvement funds for Back to School Night, parent teacher conferences, and other family activities. The goal will be to increase parent interest and engagement in the school community.

****Provide a separate response for each question.***

SCHOOLWIDE: HIGHLY QUALIFIED STAFF *ESEA §(b)(1)(E)*

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(E) Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.

High poverty, low-performing schools are often staffed with disproportionately high numbers of teachers who are not highly qualified. To address this disproportionality, the *ESEA* requires that all teachers of core academic subjects and instructional paraprofessionals in a schoolwide program meet the qualifications required by §1119. Student achievement increases in schools where teaching and learning have the highest priority, and students achieve at higher levels when taught by teachers who know their subject matter and are skilled in teaching it.

Strategies to Attract and Retain Highly-Qualified Staff

	Number & Percent	Description of Strategy to Retain HQ Staff
Teachers who meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	75 (out of 78)	We are trying to make Foundation Academies a better place to work to retain highly qualified staff by providing: 1) Time for teachers to collaborate 2) Increasing professional development opportunities 3) Increasing benefits such as an employer matching program
	96%	
Teachers who do not meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	3 (out of 78)	
	4%	
Instructional Paraprofessionals who meet the qualifications required by <i>ESEA</i> (education, passing score on ParaPro test)	1 (out of 1)	We are trying to make Foundation Academies a better place to work to retain highly qualified staff by providing: 1) Time for teachers to collaborate 2) Increasing professional development opportunities
	100%	
Paraprofessionals providing instructional assistance who do not meet the qualifications required by <i>ESEA</i> (education, passing score on ParaPro test)*	0 (out of 1)	
	0%	

* The district must assign these instructional paraprofessionals to non-instructional duties for 100% of their schedule, reassign them to a school in the district that does not operate a Title I schoolwide program, or terminate their employment with the district.

SCHOOLWIDE: HIGHLY QUALIFIED STAFF *ESEA §(b)(1)(E)*

Although recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers is an on-going challenge in high poverty schools, low-performing students in these schools have a special need for excellent teachers. The schoolwide plan, therefore, must describe the strategies the school will utilize to attract and retain highly-qualified teachers.

Description of strategies to attract highly-qualified teachers to high-need schools	Individuals Responsible
1) Partnerships with TFA (Teach for America) and also local Universities and Colleges to recruit new teachers and create excitement on local campuses and in the community about the school 2) Increased Social Media (LinkedIn, Facebook, Twitter, etc.) to communicate to a larger scale of potential supporters and potential new staff members. 3) Teacher and staff recruitment open houses throughout the year. 4) Partnerships with professional organizations to ensure high quality applicant pool.	Talent Staff